DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 257 CS 203 218

AUTHOR Emig, Janet A.; Parker, Robert P., Jr.
TITLE Responding to Student Writing: Building a Theory of the Evaluating Process.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 29p.; Report prepared at Rutgers, The State University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Composition (Literary); *Composition Skills (Literary); *Educational Theories; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Needs; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Secondary Education; *Student Evaluation; Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a theory of individual differences in teachers' evaluation of student composition, which is based on the notion that certain formulations of writers in various disciplines--such as literary criticism, philosophy, and psychology--can provide a basis for understanding. Sources tapped include, among others, the following titles: Meyer Abrams' "The Mirror and the Lamp" (literary analysis), John Dewey's "Art as Experience" and Michael Polanyi's "The Tacit Dimension" (philosophy), George Kelley's "A Theory of Personality" (psychology), and Jean Piaget's "Structuralism" (interdisciplinary). A nine-item questionnaire is included that is designed to promote teachers' awareness of their values and attitudes which influence the evaluation of student writing. Teaching, particularly responding to student writing, is therefore viewed as dependent on the ability to respond to self, to others, and to natural and human-made phenomena. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED136257

RESPONDING TO STUDENT WRITING: BUILDING A THEORY OF THE EVALUATING PROCESS[1]

JANET A. EMIG
ROBERT P. PARKER, JR.

Need for a Theory

We differ in the ways we evaluate writing--teachers, examiners, researchers. The fact is so well-known as to be a banality, with the evidence particularly clear that unless--and sometimes if--we are trained together for sustained periods, we cannot agree about the merits of a given piece of writing. Many studies document our failure.[2]

But important and unexamined questions lie behind this dismaying if unsurprising finding. How and why do we differ? How and why may training and working together lessen or even erase our differences? Perhaps more interesting: can we predict how we as individuals and as members of given groups will respond to certain pieces of student writing? and, if so, what criteria prove telling? In a composition research seminar conducted during Fall Semester 1973 at Rutgers, we became aware in our working together not only of the dimensions of the problem but also of possible ways of approaching and responding to these questions.[3]

Our specific task was to try achieving consensus in assigning a group of tenth-grade themes to certain Audience

CS 203 218

and Function (Mode) categories devised by James Britton and others in the Writing Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London as we replicated their Schools Council study on composition.[4] In our initial self-training sessions we soon revealed marked differences in our responses to the sample themes and in our strategies for evaluation, engaging in processes and practices that we have not seen described in the literature.

For example, when assigning themes to categories, it turned out that most of us based our decision not upon a holistic response--although such was our stated aim--but upon our evaluation of certain portions of the theme. For some of us, how the theme began--the first two paragraphs--regularly determined our decision of category; for others, how the theme ended--the last paragraph or two--was determinor for a third group, the smallest, what counted was the center--how notions were developed and sequenced. The assumption in the literature is that we can and do evaluate globally (see for example "How to measure growth in writing," by Paul Diederich, The English Journal, April, 1967),[5] but can we? Do we? In practice our group proceeded what might be called metonoymically--that is, we judged and predicted whole from part. Do others do as we did? And if such practices affect validity of evaluation, how?

We also differed of course in engagement, in the intensity of our involvement with different themes. We

valued some above others, the ways certain contents fused with certain forms. And although initially our own choices and tastes sometimes baffled us, if we were pressed enough by other members of the seminar along certain lines of questioning, we could eventually make coherent statements about our choices. (We will set out these lines of questioning later in the paper.)

We differed then, expectedly, with one another. But we also differed with ourselves. As individuals we read the same theme differently on different occasions; the greater the period of time intervening and the greater the difference in context, the wider was the divergence in our evaluation, both in what we perceived and in how what we perceived affected our evaluation.

Why? What elements are at work to make these differences, both within us and among us? Certain formulations by certain writers across disciplines--literary criticism, philosophy, psychology--can, we think, lend insights if not answers to this question. Indeed, their statements combined can, we think, provide a sturdy transdisciplinary base for understanding what we do when we respond to student writing; for learning what is involved in this intricate, subtle, and inevitably personal process.

Sources we will tap include works from literary analysis, such as Meyer Abrams' The Mirror and the Lamp (1959); from philosophy, such as John Dewey's Art as Experience (1934);

Michael Polanyi's The Tacit Dimension (1967) and Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness (1953); from psychology, such as George Kelly's A Theory of Personality (1963); and from curriculum theory (debatable, of course, if it qualifies as a discipline), such as Dwayne Huebner's "Curricular Meanings and Classroom Language" (1964). We will also discuss Jean Piaget, whose already transdisciplinary interests are revealed, say, in Structuralism (1970) and Biology and Knowledge (1971).

Basic Premise: Centrality of Anticipation in Response

The psychologist George Kelly provides a generative premise for a theory of evaluation with The Psychology of Personal Constructs (1955), particularly through the first three chapters published by the Norton Library as A Theory of Personality. Kelly's central hypothesis, or 'fundamental postulate' as he terms it, is that

> A person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events.[6]

Following a definition of each term in this postulate (despite 'psychologically channelized,' Kelly writes his theory in English), he sets forth eleven corollaries that elaborate on the postulate. Central to Kelly's theory is the notion that anticipating is our most crucial cognitive process. Kelly defines anticipating, in part, as 'the creative capacity of the living thing to represent the environment, not merely to respond to it.' It is at once active and interactive,

both 'the push and the pull of the psychology of personal constructs.'

Other scholars agree with the importance Kelly assigns to anticipating. A few years after Kelly, George Miller and Karl Pribram developed a comparable notion in their important and unpursued study Plans and the Structure of Behavior (1960). And long before all three, at least by thirty years, the Swiss epistemologist, Jean Piaget, was already writing persuasively about how infants and children develop evolving 'schemata' by which they anticipate and make sense of their ongoing experiences.[7]

Our basic assumption will be then that responding to a student theme is an event and that how the reader anticipates that particular event is an exemplar of Kelly's central postulate and determines the nature of his response. Two vast questions then: (1) what do we expect or not expect to find in a student theme, and why?; (2) what factors affect how we anticipate this particular event, the student theme? (Throughout the discussion, our ambition is to make clear when we are dealing with the theme itself; when, with our response to it; and when, with that astonishingly complex double phenomenon of theme and response.)

Theme as Event or Experience

A first question then about anticipation and evaluation: do we regard our encounter with a student theme as an

event? Or to shift terms slightly, do we expect, do we anticipate having an experience when we read and respond to a student theme?

John Dewey provides the most telling criteria for knowing whether or not we are having 'an experience' in two famous Chapter Three's--the first in Art as Experience (1934); the second, in Experience and Education (1938). The most important criterion, according to Dewey, is that what occurs possess a single pervading quality that makes us able to identify it as something separable from our ongoing continuum of experiencing. A single, pervading quality gives the experience its aesthetic unity and makes it satisfying "because it possesses internal integration and fulfillment reached through ordered and organized movement," with our sense of aesthetic unity dependent upon the strength of engagement between experiencer and experience.

Some of you may pause at this point and say, "Yes, but that's just the problem: this piece of student writing doesn't possess a single pervading quality so that I can separate and distinguish it from the hundreds, even thousands of student themes I've already read. So as for having an aesthetic quality, for me it has none. Besides, it's not internally organized, much less integrated. In fact, I'd describe it as faltering and disheveled. How can I regard my encounter with this theme as having an experience?"

This response is understandable: one's sense of aesthetic unity depends, according to Dewey, upon whether or not the experience engages us. One theme may engage us where another does not. As we noted in the introduction, why this might be so is a question underlying much of the rest of our speculation. (If no student themes engage our important attention, our problems as teachers, however, are very, very serious indeed; and it's likely that we should seek another profession.)

Experience, Meaning, and Knowing

Most of us who are not avowed Absurdists attach meaningfulness to having an experience (perhaps Dewey thought this was too self-evident to say). Actually, when we respond to student writing, we can make three assumptions about meaning and having this experience:

1) That the student must mean something by what he has written;
2) That as responders we can somehow discern and interact with this meaning;
3) That our discerning and knowing need not necessarily be conscious, explicit knowing.

A comment on the first assumption: That as teachers we want to have an experience with what students write and with other work they and we do is evidenced by our steady complaints that courses and workshops in English and education

are irrelevant to our classrooms (another way of saying of course that they lack meaning). At the same time, to demonstrate our confusion, many of us talk or behave as if it is not possible for anyone, teacher or student, to have an experience in our current context of educational institutions and systems. This failure of expectation for having an experience seems always to be passed off with the non-explanation that we have become justifiably cynical.

An emendation on the third assumption: In what ways other than consciously, rationally, explicitly can we 'know' a theme? Obviously, we need another definition of knowing. The scientist-turned-philosopher Michael Polanyi provides such a definition with his concept of 'tacit knowing.'[8]

Tacit knowing is knowing more than one can tell, as in the way we recognize a face without necessarily being able to describe discrete features. For tacit knowing to occur, one must attend (heed) in a particular way. There must be a from-to attending--in Polanyi's terms, from the 'particulars' to 'their joint meaning.' What makes from/to attending possible is the assumption that we are dealing with "a coordinated performance":

> We must surmise that we are faced with some coordinated performance, before we can try to understand it, and must go on trying to pick out the features that are essential to the performance, <u>with a view to the action felt to be at work in it</u> (italics ours).[9]

Polanyi differentiates between picking out such features and the 'meticulous detailing' of these: the second procedure may lead, he says, to 'obscuring beyond recall the total performance.' Although there are hazards in a discussion like this one in exaggerating synonymity between constructs and theories, there seem to be similarities here between Polanyi's notion of 'the total performance' and Dewey's criterion of the pervading and unifying aesthetic quality of "an" experience.

The process by which tacit knowing best proceeds is through the achievement of indwelling, which might be defined as a heightened form of comprehending. Polanyi's metaphor for his term is essentially physiological--more specifically, indwelling seems to involve incorporation and ingestion: he speaks of 'extending our body to include it' (he seems at times to mean this almost literally).

Polanyi thinks that indwelling is crucial in education. He believes that a pupil must achieve indwelling if he is fully to comprehend what the teacher is trying to convey:[10]

> We have seen that tacit knowledge dwells in our awareness of particulars while bearing on an entity which the particulars jointly constitute. In order to share this indwelling, the pupil must presume that a teaching which appears meaningless to start with has in fact a meaning which can be discovered

> by hitting on the same kind of indwelling as the teacher is practicing. Such an effort is based on accepting the teacher's authority.[11]

We would like to suggest the power of these comments for responding to student writing, if one reverses in this passage pupil and teacher. Here is the passage rewritten with these substitutions:

> . . . In order to share this indwelling, the teacher must presume that writing which appears meaningless to start with has in fact a meaning which can be discovered by hitting on the same kind of indwelling as the pupil is practicing. (Such an effort is based upon accepting the pupil's authority.)

The pupil's authority is of a particular kind; it is for his making meaning, or at least attempting to make meaning, from his experience, even though the specific assignment to which he is responding may make his efforts difficult or impossible.[12]

The nature of the most effective tacit knowing then is three-fold: (1) accepting that there may be unique values in tacit knowing; (2) engaging in a from/to attending that moves from the particulars of a piece to their joint meaning, always seeking the action felt to be at work in it; and (3) trying to match the indwelling of the pupil, with the awareness that what initially appears meaningless may yield its meaning if the teacher persists in striving for the match.

There are important implications here when contrasted with our customary practices. Perhaps the most significant have to do with the difference between what Polanyi calls focal and peripheral attending. With our usual gift for reversal and confusion, in evaluation too many of us read for details--margins, spelling, usage errors--although by reading for detail, we obviously eliminate the possibility for achieving indwelling in them; we have given the peripherals our focal attending and the focus of the writing--its possible meaning--our peripheral attending.

The second implication concerns the kinds of assignment we give. We seldom ask ourselves if the assignment given meshes with the student's current meaning-making capabilities--his level of cognitive development, his mastery of given rhetorical and literary forms--if he can achieve indwelling with our assignment.

Effect of Our Own Experiences upon Anticipation

What elements in our experience affect how we anticipate this event, this experience, the student theme? Assuredly, for one, our own experiences with school-sponsored writing. What kind(s) of writing did we do in elementary and secondary school but especially, of course, as undergraduate and as graduate students/ How was this writing received and responded to--with caring? savagery? indifference (which may be a form of savagery)? Also, with what critical attitudes were we

imbued? How, chiefly, were we trained to regard literature--that "Writing by Others"?

What kinds of writing in schools did we ourselves do? One wonders if there are any generalizations that hold for our experiences in elementary and secondary school, especially since we do not have even adequate status studies K-12, past or present, to tap for confirmation. Undoubtedly then what follows here are presumptions rather than descriptions. Our guesses are, however, that for most of us imaginative writing was sponsored as a regular part of the language arts curriculum only in elementary school and perhaps junior high. Once we entered high school, imaginative and reflexive writing became the province of a specialized course called "Creative Writing" and taken by only an elite few--the same elite few who probably ran the literary magazine if there was one. Otherwise, most of us settled into the extensive/expository/transactional mode that also marked the only school-sponsored mode honored throughout college and graduate school.

How was our writing received and responded to? Again, who can really make generalizations, given the paucity of data? If we attribute how much writing most Americans do for pleasure after graduation, we have the same devastatingly simple criterion that damns our teaching of reading. Many of us hate to write--why, if what we wrote in schools was sensitively received? In this realm it takes more self-control than at least one of us possesses not to grow anecdotal; but

since the anecdotal may be our only source of data here, so be it. After I (JE) had written almost four chapters of the dissertation that became the NCTE Research Report Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders, my eighth advisor (there was a revolving door at Harvard for English Education) told me to find another topic since "being interested in how children write is not unlike being interested in how cripples skate." In a recent workshop for secondary teachers, the women in the group literally could not read--much less read with understanding and appreciation--any theme by other participants that did not have what might be called a Rebecca-of-Sunny-Brook Farm approach to life; and their comments to the young male writers in the groups could only be characterized as fascistic in their preference for sunniness. As for comments to young children, the British provide some data, including the now almost-classic horror tale below, used by Brian Jackson as epigraph for English versus Examinations:

> 'My father is on the broad side and tall side. My father was a hard working man and he had a lot of money. He was not fat or thin. . . . His age was about thirty years when he died, he had a good reputation, he is a married man. When he was in hospital I went to see him every Sunday afternoon. I asked him how he was going on, he told me he was getting a lot better. My father was very kind to me, and gave me and my cousins cigarette cards. He

likes doing woodwork, my father, for me, and he likes a little game of cards now and then; or a game of darts. He chops the wood and saws the planks and he is a handsome man but he is dead. He worked at the rubber works before he died.'

9-year-old boy

Teacher's comment: 'Tenses. You keep mixing past and present.'[13]

As to the effect of our critical training, for far too many of us, the outcome has been a destructive ambivalence as we respond to student writing: we at once insist upon operating as critics, the only role with language for which we have been trained with any thoroughness, all the while believing, or at least saying, that what students write is not literature and therefore not worthy of our summoning with alarms and clanging that massive critical apparatus that always champs curried, pawing, nostrils steaming behind the stable door.

One of the deepest ironies here is that we often do not acknowledge that we hold a single immutable critical point of view, much less what that point of view may be and how it may affect how we respond to student writing.

In The Mirror and the Lamp (1953) Meyer Abrams sets out what he calls the four 'coordinates' of literary criticism:

UNIVERSE

WORK

ART AUDIENCE

The critic, he says, tends to take one of these coordinates as his central concern or focus when dealing with a given piece of literature. Every critic attends primarily, although not necessarily exclusively, to that work in terms of one of the following relationships (presented here in order of their historical development):

1) the relationship of work to universe; the work is viewed as an imitation of the world (the mirror image), and it is judged in terms of the accuracy and clarity with which it reflects some aspect of the world (Aristotelian Criticism);
2) the relationship of work to audience: the work is considered in its impact on an audience, and it is judged by its effectiveness in persuading and influencing (Rhetorical or Pragmatic Criticism);
3) the relationship of work to artist: the work is seen as the "overflow, utterance, or projection of the thought and feeling" of the artist (the lamp image), and it is judged by the spontaneity and sincerity and truthfulness with which it reveals the artist's atate of mind (Romantic or Expressive Criticism); and

4) the relationship of the work to itself, to its own internal organisation: the work is viewed as detached and self-sufficient, and it is judged by "criteria intrinsic to its own mode of being" (New or Objective Criticism).[14]

It is probably not inaccurate to suggest that most of us--at least most of us above a certain age--have been trained by American undergraduate and graduate departments of English to focus on Coordinate #4, the relationship of the work to itself. We are, or were, in other words, good little New Critics: we had to be to survive our training as well as to prosper in academe.

Because of the dominance of this single critical point of view for at least two decades, many of us, unless we read an Abrams, Northrop Frye or Louise Rosenblatt or introspect more than most, are not even aware that we are operating from one of a number of possible points of view. Also, our critical position is not only unacknowledged but profoundly confused and contaminated. For we are not pristine New Critics: what sensible person can be (as a single current example, who reads Gulag Archipelago exclusively for its internal organization?). When we respond to student writing, many of us also pull in all kinds of irrelevancies from classical rhetoric--not straight Aristotle or Cicero or Quintilian, but dilutions and bastardizations represented, say, by Hugh Blair's Lectures on Belles Lettres (1834), such as the Ciceronian

schema reduced to recommendations for a six-part outline. Or, no matter the mode, our demand for that anachronism the topic sentence, that bane from Bain, a concept good and true only if the student is writing an eighteenth-century essay--which he is, if he wishes to please too many of our rhetoric texts and our freshman English instructors.

The least we must acknowledge is that by choosing to proceed as New Critics, by choosing to emphasize the relationship of the work to itself, we have very likely chosen the least promising coordinate for responding to student writing. First, the emphasis is product- rather than process-centered, the more appropriate center for the learning-teaching exchange. Second, and closely related, the New Critical point of view ignores the developmental dimension, the whole matter of stages of cognitive and emotional (probably a part of cognitive) growth. To be product-centered then is to be unproductive in terms of a student's learning through writing.

Our personal experience, present, past and future, perhaps far more than our exclusively academic experiences, affect how we anticipate a student theme, perhaps determining the nature of our interest, our involvement. To understand the possible effects of our personal experiences, a 'composite model' constructed by James Kinneavy in his seminal A Theory of Discourse from the writings of the major phenomenologists--Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Gušdorf, Cassirer (perhaps not a group

member)--proves exceptionally helpful. For the model, the work of Sartre is central, particularly his concept of the self in its "for-Itself" aspect. Kinneavy's explication is too tidy and too illuminating not to quote extensively:

> For all of them the self is constituted by combinations of different kinds of consciousnesses. There is a perceiving 'For-Itself' which is constituted as consciousness by distinguishing itself from the world of which it is conscious and to which it is present; this 'For-Itself' is therefore in need of the world to establish itself as consciousness. Further, to establish itself as a knowing self-consciousness it must be aware of other knowing consciousnesses from which it is also distinct--these other consciousness are the 'Others.' The self, therefore, is a composite for a Being-for-Itself, a Being-for-Others, and a Being-in-the-World. . . .
>
> Sartre's concept of the For-Itself is constituted by its presence in the world; as past, the For-Itself is constituted by what it has made of itself in its previous actions and expressions; as future, the For-Itself is what it is working on to make itself--it is its possibilities. In other words, we are what we are conscious of being in the face of reality; we are, whether we like it or not, what we have made of ourselves in the past; finally, we are

what we are striving to be (Sartre, b, 152-72).[15]

Each of these aspects of the For-Itself affects how we respond to a given piece of student writing: there are positive and negative elements depending probably upon the kind of resonance, the 'match' if you will, that the responder finds with his own past, present, and future experiences. It is understandable perhaps even self-evident that we read with the greatest resonance if there are certain kinds of match between the nature and treatment (attitude) of the student's life experiences set forth in the theme and of our own current experiences. Resonance can also be great if the student experience matches our own past experience, particularly our carefully edited and enhanced if not transformed version of it. The future is also powerful--indeed, for Sartre, it can be the most powerful of all. Again, to quote Kinneavy:

> . . . the For-Itself is, both in its appraisal of its past and in its projection towards its future, fundamentally a value consciousness. As he [Sartre] says, 'The for-itself cannot appear without being haunted by value and projected toward its own possibles' (b. 117).[16]

There are two ways to view this 'match game,' to use Joe McVicker Hunt's metaphor[17]--either developmentally or, in a larger sense, humanistically. The most powerful developmental description of personal growth is probably that of Erik Erikson in Childhood and Society (1950). A

brilliant summary of Erikson's point of view appears as Chapter 6, "The Course of Emotional Growth," in Fantasy and Feeling in Education by Richard M. Jones; another occurs as Chapter 6, Childhood and Society Achieved," in Robert Coles' Erik Erikson: The Growth of His Work (1970). Erikson holds an epigenetic view of development that is, in contrast to Freud and others who focus upon the effects of early childhood events and traumas upon adult behavior, Erikson believes that throughout our lives we experience crises--he calls them nuclear growth crises--that continually shape and reshape our identity and behavior.

Erikson suggests that at various stages of our lives we have central concerns that focus and absorb our emotional energy. For example, someone in early adulthood (say, 18-25) probably has as a current life project seeking intimacy, finding someone with whom to share a life. He may write about his current life project either directly or metaphorically. His reader may be middle-aged (say, 40-55); he may have as his current life project that which Erikson suggests is representative of that age, which is nurturance and care of the young (broadly defined: Erikson does not mean parochial interest only in ones own literal children). Or his reader, on the other hand, although middle-aged, may also be seeking intimacy with someone new after just experiencing a painful divorce. It seems fairly obvious that these two readers will bring different values, different kinds of engagement to their

reading of the student revelations because of the nature of their own concerns--one more possibly parental and elegaic; the other more contemporaneous, and possibly angry or envious if his own search goes less well than his student's.

Another example: suppose the teacher has believed that he could not marry or live with someone until he finished a long and arduous period of professional training, such as, say, eight years spent achieving his Ph.D. And suppose the student on the other hand is a doctoral candidate but living with someone who not only loves but licerally supports him. How will the reader who has delayed gratification regard his young writer who has not and who is currently happy? How will he respond to an account of pleasure and current joy? (Anyone who claims he will not be influenced at all by their differing situations reveals the innocence of a true New Critic!)

There is also a humanistic view--to some of you, more hopeful, more promising than a developmental approach. And that is that we are all engaged, no matter our age or circumstances in one single shared life project: to grow more adult, to develop our gifts, in Freud's great summary, to love and to work.

We all, in other words, share a single life project that makes possible our ability to respond with resonance to descriptions of any portions of it. Too, no matter the school of criticism in which we have been brought up and

trained, all schools do share a common premise--that only the activated imagination of the reader brings any work to full life. So that if we read imaginatively, as well as securely, we can overcome the hazards and intrusions of any and all differences--age, sex, race, temperament, emotional state, training, cultural or class background and membership.

Implications for Research and Classroom Practices

To return then in conclusion to certain questions posed at the beginning of this paper: Is it possible, for example, to predict for oneself or for others how we will respond to a student theme?

We suggest that it is, if we respond in interview or, probably more probing, in an interview or an exchange with a colleague to a cluster of questions comparable to those below. The uses of such a catalogue are manifold: for enhanced individual awareness; for enhanced group awareness, of colleagues or of, say, teachers in pre-service or in-service training; as a data bank for actual research (we have in fact begun such a project in our Writing Research Project at Rutgers):[18]

Responding to Student Writing

1. Try to recall your very first experiences with writing in school. What did you write? How did you feel about it? How did your teachers receive your compositions?

2. Did you write many poems or stories in school? What age(s) were you? Describe what you wrote, how you felt about them, and how your teacher responded.

3. Do you recall any specific comments any teacher ever gave you? If so, describe the paper's topic and content, your age, and the teacher's response to it.

4. Describe your training in literary analysis, both as an undergraduate and as a graduate and if you can remember, as a high school student. If there was an exclusive or a predominant point of view espoused, what was it? Could you describe yourself as a believer in that mode?

5. What kind(s) of assignments do you give? In which mode(s)? Why? Do you give multiple choice assignments? Why? Do you give unassigned writing? In what ratio to assigned writing? Why?

6. What do you think are the values, if any, of students writing poems and stories in elementary school? High school? College? Graduate school?

7. If you were to specify what projects for your life are currently of greatest importance to you, what would these be?

8. When you were the age of your current students, what projects for your life were of greatest importance?

9. Are there any contents or treatments of contents by students that truly distress and/or anger you? What are these? Can you speculate why you object to them?

Conclusion

In his fresh look at curriculum entitled "Classroom Language and Curricular Meanings," Dwayne Huebner suggests that "education may be conceived to be the influencing of the student's response-ability"--by which he means the student's ability to respond to himself and to others as well as to natural and man-made phenomena.[19] Teaching, too, particularly responding to student writing, should probably also become for all of us the steady, serious, imaginative development of our own response-abilities.

Janet A. Emig
~~Associate~~ Professor

and

Robert P. Parker, Jr.
Associate Professor

Rutgers--The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

FOOTNOTES

1. The writing of this paper was partially sponsored by a grant from The Research Council of Rutgers--The State University, New Jersey, 1973.

2. See for example the discussions of rater variables and of colleague variables in Braddock et al., Research in Written Composition (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1963), especially the correlations of the 1961 Diederich Study (p. 23) and of CEEB one-hour composition tests for 1943 and 1944 (p. 41).

3. We thank our student colleagues from this seminar who contributed steady insight to this formulation: Nadine Bellars, Susan Kaufman, Katherine Kenfield, Louisa Rogers, Merle Sharp, Myrna Smith, and Louise Stokes.

4. Succintly described by Nancy Martin in "Report to the [Bullock] Committee of Inquiry into Reading and the Use of English," HMSO, January, 1973 (mimeo). The full descriptions of the Mode and Audience categories appears as "What's the Use?" by James Britton in The Context of Language, Educational Review, XXIII, 3 (June, 1971), 205-219.

5. Diederich, pp. 435-449.

6. Kelly, p. 46.

7. Piaget, Judgment and Reasoning in the Child, trans. Marjorie Worden. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1926 (original French edition, 1924).

8. The Tacit Dimension (New York: Anchor Books, 1967).

9. Ibid., p. 30.

10. C. S. Lewis, "Blusfels and Flalanferes," in The Importance of Language, Max Black (ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962).

11. Polanyi, op. cit., p. 61.

12. Meaning-making, like the equally useful "languaging," is the coinage of Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner in chapters 8 and 9 of Teaching As a Subversive Activity.

13. (London: Chatto and Windus, 1965).

14. Meyer Abrams. The Mirror and the Lamp (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953).

15. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 398.

16. Ibid., p. 400.

17. Intelligence and Experience (New York: Ronald Press, 1961).

18. If you would like to participate, please write to us for details: Graduate School of Education, 10 Seminary Place, New Brunswick, N. J. 08903.

19. In Language and Meaning (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, NEA, 1966), p. 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Meyer. The Mirror and the Lamp. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. Research in Written Composition. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1963.

Britton, James. Language and Learning. Baltimore: Penguin Education, 1971.

_____. "What's the Use?" in The Context of Language, ed. by Andrew Wilkinson. Birmingham, Eng.: University of Birmingham School of Education, 19 .

Cassirer, Ernst. An Essay on Man. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.

Coles, Robert. Erik H. Erikson: The Growth of His Work. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970.

Dewey, John. Art as Experience. N.Y.: Capricorn Books, 1958.

_____. Experience and Education. N.Y.: Collier Books, 1971.

Diederich, Paul. "How to measure growth in writing," English Journal (April, 1967).

_____, John French and Sydell Carltin. Factors in Judgement of Writing Ability. Research Bulletin RB-61-15 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1961).

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. N.Y.: W. W. Norton, 1963.

Gusdorf, George. Speaking. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1965.

Huebner, Dwayne. "Curricular Language and Classroom Meanings," in Language and Meaning. Washington, D.C.: NEA, ASCD, 1966.

Hunt, J. McVicker. Intelligence and Experience. N.Y.: Ronald Press, 1961.

Jackson, Brian. English versus Examinations. London: Chatto and Windus, 1963.

Jones, Richard M. Fantasy and Feeling in Education. N.Y.: New York University Press, 1968.

Kelly, George. A Theory of Personality. N.Y.: W. W. Norton, 1963.

Kinneavy, James. A Theory of Discourse. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Lewis, C. S. "Bluspels and Flalanferes," in The Importance of Language ed. by Max Black. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Martin, Nancy. Report to the Bullock Committee. Mimeographed.

Miller, George, Eugene Galanter and Karl Pribram. Plans and the Structure of Behavior. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Piaget, Jean. The Early Growth of Logic in the Child. N.Y.: Humanities Press, 1970.

_____. Biology and Knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

_____. Structuralism. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1970.

Polanyi, Michael. The Tacit Dimension. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1965.

Rosen, Harold. Assessing Compositions. London: London Association for the Teaching of English, 1965.

Postman, Neil and Charles Weingarten. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. N.Y.: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. Being and Nothingness. N.Y.: Philosophical Library, 1956.